

1 encompassed all his patents issued prior to the secrecy order, *res judicata* would bar him from raising
2 them now.

3 Plaintiff also alludes to a patent granted after the issuance of the secrecy order (USP
4 5,545,063, issued August 1996; Motion, p. 2). This patent could not have been affected by the
5 secrecy order and thus Plaintiff has no standing to bring a § 183 claim concerning it. Nor did Plaintiff
6 raise this issue in his response to Defendant's motion to dismiss or indicate now why he was prevented
7 from doing so.

8 Plaintiff seeks to introduce new evidence concerning his "demonstrable losses," citing patents
9 granted to a civilian company (Siemens AG's Abdel Maksoud Patents No. 6,881,110 and 7,052,339;
10 Motion, p. 3) which allegedly cite patents belonging to him. Not only is Siemens AG not before this
11 Court as a party to this lawsuit, but the order to dismiss was not premised on Plaintiff's ability to
12 demonstrate that he had suffered damages. There is nothing to reconsider on that issue.

13 **Conclusion**

14 Plaintiff has failed to plead any grounds under which a motion to reconsider might be granted.
15 The motion will be DENIED.

16
17 The clerk is directed to provide copies of this order to all counsel of record.

18 Dated: February _21_, 2007

19
20 

21 Marsha J. Pechman
22 U.S. District Judge
23
24
25